

PHYSICAL STATES IN CANONICALLY QUANTIZED SUPERGRAVITY

Sean M. Carroll[†]

*Center for Theoretical Physics, Laboratory for Nuclear Science and Department of Physics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA*

Daniel Z. Freedman^{*}

CERN, Theory Division, CH-1211, Geneva 23, Switzerland

Miguel E. Ortiz[‡]

*Center for Theoretical Physics, Laboratory for Nuclear Science and Department of Physics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA*

and

Don N. Page[§]

*CIAR Cosmology Program, Theoretical Physical Institute
Department of Physics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2J1*

Submitted to Nuclear Physics B

Abstract

We discuss the canonical quantization of $N = 1$ supergravity in the functional Schrödinger representation. Although the form of the supersymmetry constraints suggests that there are solutions of definite order n in the fermion fields, we show that there are no such states for any finite n . For $n = 0$, a simple scaling argument definitively excludes the purely bosonic states discussed by D'Eath. For $n > 0$, the argument is based on a mode expansion of the gravitino field on the quantization 3-surface. It is thus suggested that physical states in supergravity have infinite Grassmann number. This is confirmed for the free spin-3/2 field, for which we find that states satisfying the gauge constraints contain an infinite product of fermion mode operators.

CTP # 2279

January 1994

hep-th/9401155

[†] e-mail: carroll@marie.mit.edu

^{*} Permanent address: *Department of Mathematics and Center for Theoretical Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA.* e-mail: dzf@math.mit.edu

[‡] e-mail: ortiz@mitlms.mit.edu

[§] e-mail: don@phys.ualberta.ca

1. INTRODUCTION

Since supergravity is a theory with gauged space-time symmetries, physical state functionals in the quantum theory satisfy constraint equations that contain non-perturbative information of potential importance [teitelboim,fradkin,d84]. The quantum constraint equations were discussed in 1984 by D'Eath [d84], and he has recently [d93] analyzed the equations for (3+1)-dimensional supergravity to obtain surprising information about exact solutions. This work has motivated us to study the situation, and we present our results below.

There are constraints for each of the gauge symmetries contained in the theory, viz local Lorentz invariance, supersymmetry, and spacetime diffeomorphisms. Lorentz invariance is easy to implement, and the Dirac/Poisson bracket structure ensures that all constraints are satisfied by a Lorentz invariant supersymmetric state. The supersymmetry constraints are thus the central issue. Since these constraints are homogeneous in the gravitino field $\psi_{Ai}(\mathbf{x})$, it is consistent to look for solutions involving homogeneous functionals of order ψ^n . Such states may be called Grassmann number n states.

A simple scaling argument can be applied to the supersymmetry constraint to show that there are no bosonic ($n = 0$) states. The situation for states of finite, non-zero Grassmann number n is analyzed using a mode decomposition of $\psi_{Ai}(\mathbf{x})$ on an initial-value surface Σ . We present an argument that there are also no states with finite n . This requires explicit knowledge of the mode functions to ascertain the linear independence of various terms in the constraint equations. The mode equations, which we believe to be new, can be solved explicitly only when Σ is a flat 3-surface, when the linear independence is then easily shown. We believe, but have no explicit proof, that this property holds for a general surface Σ . We therefore conclude that all physical states in canonically quantized supergravity in a holomorphic or anti-holomorphic representation have infinite Grassmann

number.

As a check on this conclusion, we have examined the free spin-3/2 field which has a residual abelian gauge supersymmetry and corresponding constraints. We solve the constraints explicitly using the mode-number basis, and we find that the most general physical state functional contains an infinite product of Grassmann-valued mode coefficients. Such a state may be considered to have infinite Grassmann number in the sense described above. It is instructive to note that there are two types of infinity present in both the holomorphic and anti-holomorphic representations, one due the structure of the Dirac sea, and a second due to the fixing of gauge degrees of freedom.

Our conclusions about physical states in the free and interacting theories are compatible with a recent analysis of 2+1 and perturbative 3+1 dimensional supergravity [nicolai]. In the final section we explain how our conclusions are also compatible with minisuperspace studies, which have found bosonic physical states [mini]. Unfortunately we disagree with D'Eath who has claimed in [d93] to have exhibited exact bosonic state functionals which satisfy the constraints in the full theory. Such states are definitively ruled out by the scaling argument referred to above.

2. CANONICAL QUANTIZATION OF N=1 SUPERGRAVITY

For Weyl spinor gravitino fields $\psi_{A\mu}$ and $\bar{\psi}_{A'\mu}$ and vierbein E^a_μ , the covariant $N=1$ supergravity Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{8\kappa^2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \varepsilon_{abcd} E^a_\mu E^b_\nu R^{cd}_{\rho\sigma} - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} (\bar{\psi}_\mu E^a_\nu \bar{\sigma}_a D_\rho \psi_\sigma - D_\rho \bar{\psi}_\mu E^a_\nu \bar{\sigma}_a \psi_\sigma) . \quad (2.1)$$

Here $\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ and ε_{abcd} are Levi-Civita tensors with curved and flat indices, respectively and $g_{\mu\nu}$ and the flat metric η_{ab} have signature $+, -, -, -$. $R^{cd}_{\rho\sigma}$ is the curvature tensor defined

using a connection with torsion $W^ab{}_\mu = \Omega^ab{}_\mu + \kappa^ab{}_\mu$, where $\Omega^ab{}_\mu$ is the usual torsion free connection defined by the requirement that $D_{[\mu}^\Omega E^a{}_{\nu]} = 0$, and $\kappa^ab{}_\mu$ is the contortion,

$$\kappa^ab{}_\mu = \frac{i\kappa^2}{2} E^{a\rho} E^{b\sigma} [\bar{\psi}_\sigma E^c{}_\rho \bar{\sigma}_c \psi_\mu + \bar{\psi}_\mu E^c{}_\sigma \bar{\sigma}_c \psi_\rho - \bar{\psi}_\rho E^c{}_\mu \bar{\sigma}_c \psi_\sigma] . \quad (2.2)$$

The derivative operator D_ρ defined with the full connection $W^ab{}_\rho$ acts on spinor indices as

$$D_\rho \psi_{A\mu} = \partial_\rho \psi_{A\mu} + W_A{}^B{}_\rho \psi_{B\mu}, \quad D_\rho \bar{\psi}_{A'\mu} = \partial_\rho \bar{\psi}_{A'\mu} + \bar{\psi}_{B'\mu} \bar{W}_{A'}{}^{B'}{}_\rho, \quad (2.3)$$

where $W_A{}^B{}_\rho = -\frac{1}{4} W_{ab\rho} (\sigma^a \bar{\sigma}^b)_A{}^B$, and $\bar{W}_{A'}{}^{B'}{}_\rho = -\frac{1}{4} W_{ab\rho} (\bar{\sigma}^b \sigma^a)^{B'}{}_{A'}$. The Lagrangian (2.1) is invariant under Lorentz transformations, general co-ordinate transformations, and the supersymmetry transformations

$$\delta E^a{}_\mu = -\frac{i\kappa^2}{2} [\bar{\epsilon} \bar{\sigma}^a \psi_\mu - \bar{\psi}_\mu \bar{\sigma}^a \epsilon], \quad \delta \psi_\mu = D_\mu \epsilon, \quad \delta \bar{\psi}_\mu = D_\mu \bar{\epsilon} . \quad (2.4)$$

The canonical quantization of this theory on a spacelike 3-surface Σ has been developed in [d84,teitelboim,pilati]. We summarize here only those aspects of the formalism required to define the quantum theory and its supersymmetry constraints. Our conventions, which differ from those of [d84,pilati], are summarized in Appendix A.

Let x^i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, denote co-ordinates on Σ . The dynamical variables in the Hamiltonian formalism are $e^a{}_i(\mathbf{x}) = E^a{}_i$, with $a = 0, 1, 2, 3$, conjugate momenta $p^j{}_a(\mathbf{x}) = \pi^i{}_a - \varepsilon^{ijk} \bar{\psi}_j \bar{\sigma}_a \psi_k / 2$ with $\pi^i{}_a$ the usual momentum conjugate to $e^a{}_i$ in general relativity, and fermionic variables $\psi_{Ai}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\bar{\psi}_{A'j}(\mathbf{x})$. The Dirac/Poisson brackets for (2.1) imply that the following commutators and anti-commutators hold in the quantum theory:

$$\begin{aligned} \{\psi_{Ai}(\mathbf{x}), \bar{\psi}_{A'j}(\mathbf{y})\} &= -i\hbar D_{AA'ij} \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \\ [e^a{}_i(\mathbf{x}), p^j{}_b(\mathbf{y})] &= i\hbar \delta^a{}_b \delta^j{}_i \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \\ [p^i{}_a(\mathbf{x}), p^j{}_b(\mathbf{y})] &= -\frac{i\hbar}{4} \varepsilon^{jln} \varepsilon^{ikm} \bar{\psi}_m(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\sigma}_a D_{kl} \bar{\sigma}_b \psi_n(\mathbf{x}) \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) + \text{H.c.} \\ [p^i{}_a(\mathbf{x}), \psi_{Aj}(\mathbf{y})] &= -\frac{i\hbar}{2} \varepsilon^{ikl} D_{AB'jk} \bar{\sigma}_a^{B'B} \psi_{Bl}(\mathbf{x}) \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \\ \{\psi_{Ai}(\mathbf{x}), \psi_{Bj}(\mathbf{y})\} &= \{\bar{\psi}_{A'i}(\mathbf{x}), \bar{\psi}_{B'j}(\mathbf{y})\} = [e^a{}_i(\mathbf{x}), e^b{}_j(\mathbf{y})] = 0 . \end{aligned} \quad (2.ab)$$

The matrix D and its inverse C , required below, are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{AA'ij} &= \frac{-i}{2\sqrt{-\hbar}} e^a_j e^b_i n^c (\sigma_a \bar{\sigma}_b \sigma_c)_{AA'} \\
C^{jiA'A}(\mathbf{x}) &= \varepsilon^{ijk} e^a_k \bar{\sigma}_a^{A'A} \\
C^{ijA'A} D_{AB'jk} &= \delta^{A'}_{B'} \delta^i_k \\
D_{AA'ij} C^{jkA'B} &= \delta_A^B \delta_i^k .
\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

Following [d84], we use a holomorphic representation for the fermionic variables in which wave functionals $F[e, \psi]$ depend on e^a_i and ψ_{Ai} , while p^i_a and $\bar{\psi}_{A'i}$ are realized as

$$\hat{\bar{\psi}}_{A'i}(\mathbf{x}) = -i\hbar D_{AA'ij} \frac{\delta}{\delta \psi_{Ai}(\mathbf{x})} , \tag{2.ac}$$

and

$$\hat{p}_a^i = -i\hbar \frac{\delta}{\delta e^a_i(\mathbf{x})} - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \varepsilon^{ijk} \psi_{Ak}(\mathbf{x}) D_{BA'lj} \bar{\sigma}_a^{A'A} \frac{\delta}{\delta \psi_{Bl}(\mathbf{x})} . \tag{2.ac1}$$

Alternatively, one can use a formal fermionic Fourier transform to pass to the anti-holomorphic representation

$$\tilde{F}[e, \bar{\psi}] = \int \prod d\psi_i(\mathbf{x}) F[e, \psi] e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d^3\mathbf{x} \bar{\psi}_{A'i} C^{ijA'A} \psi_{Aj}} , \tag{2.ad}$$

in which $\bar{\psi}(\mathbf{x})$ acts by multiplication and $\psi \sim \delta/\delta\bar{\psi}$. A formal factor $\prod_{\mathbf{x}} \text{Det } C$ (see [d84]) has been dropped for simplicity since it plays no role in our work. One may note that the spatial integral in the exponential in (2.ad) is the formally conserved fermionic charge which is easily obtained from the Lagrangian (2.1).

Physical state functionals must satisfy constraints arising from the gauge invariances of (2.1). The most important of these are the supersymmetry constraints, given by the field equations of ψ_{A0} and $\bar{\psi}_{A'0}$ (which appear as Lagrange multipliers in (2.1)). Remarkably, all nonlinear terms in ψ and $\bar{\psi}$ cancel in these constraints [d84], which can be written in the simple form

$$\bar{S}^{A'} F = \left[-\varepsilon^{ijk} e^a_i \bar{\sigma}_a^{A'A} (D_j \psi_{Ak}) + \frac{\hbar \kappa^2}{2} \bar{\sigma}^{aA'A} \psi_{Ai} \frac{\delta}{\delta e^a_i} \right] F = 0 , \tag{2.100}$$

$$S^A F = \left[D_j \frac{\delta}{\delta \psi_{Aj}} + \frac{\hbar \kappa^2}{2} \frac{\delta}{\delta \psi_{Bj}} D_{BA'ji} \bar{\sigma}^{aA'A} \frac{\delta}{\delta e^a_i} \right] F = 0 . \tag{2.101}$$

The covariant derivative D_i in (2.100) and (2.101) is coupled as in (2.3) to the spinor index of ψ_{Ai} , with connection

$$\omega_i^{ab} = e^{aj} \partial_{[i} e^b_{j]} + n^a \partial_i n^b + e^{aj} n^b n^c \partial_j e^{ci} - e^{aj} e^{bk} e_{ci} \partial_j e^c_k - a \leftrightarrow b , \quad (2.0)$$

where n^a is the future-directed timelike unit vector normal to Σ , uniquely determined by

$$n_a e^a_i = 0 \quad n^a n_a = 1 . \quad (2.70)$$

The connection ω_i^{ab} is defined so that $D_i n^a = 0$ and $D_{[i} e^a_{j]} = 0$. The derivative D_i also couples to spatial indices with the Levi-Civita connection intrinsic to Σ , although in most expressions this connection is absent due to antisymmetry. The S^A constraint takes a simpler form, similar to (2.100), on anti-holomorphic wave-functionals [d84].

Besides the supersymmetry constraints, there are also constraints imposing local Lorentz invariance as well as the familiar Hamiltonian and diffeomorphism constraints. The Lorentz constraint simply implies that $F[e, \psi]$ must involve variables $e^a_i(\mathbf{x})$ and $\psi_{Aj}(\mathbf{x})$ in manifestly local Lorentz invariant combinations, and is thus straightforward to satisfy. In principle, any Lorentz invariant state $F[e, \psi]$ which satisfies the S and $\bar{S}$ constraints also satisfies the Hamiltonian and diffeomorphism constraints $\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_i$, since

$$\left\{ S^A(\mathbf{x}), \bar{S}^{A'}(\mathbf{y}) \right\} F[e, \psi] = \frac{1}{2} \hbar \kappa^2 \left[n_a(\mathbf{x}) \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) + e_a^i(\mathbf{x}) \mathcal{H}_i(\mathbf{x}) \right] \bar{\sigma}_a^{A'A} \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) F[e, \psi] . \quad (2.dd)$$

Thus any normalizable Lorentz invariant solution of (2.100) and (2.101) is an exact state of quantum supergravity¹, and it is for this reason that the proposals of [d93] must be studied critically.

¹ The definition of a norm is a difficult issue in any gravitational theory. Further, to our knowledge, (2.dd) has been established only formally, that is without complete attention to operator ordering. See [nicolai2] for a discussion of operator ordering in 2+1 dimensional supergravity.

3. BOSONIC STATES

Let us consider Lorentz invariant states in the holomorphic representation. Since the supersymmetry constraints (2.100) and (2.101) are homogeneous in ψ , it is convenient to expand an arbitrary state in a power series in the Grassmann fermion fields:

$$F[e, \psi] = \sum_n F^{(n)}[e, \psi] , \quad (5.ac)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F^{(0)}[e, \psi] &= F^{(0)}[e] \\ F^{(2)}[e, \psi] &= \int d\mathbf{x}_1 d\mathbf{x}_2 K^{(2)}[e; \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2]_{AB}^{ij} \psi_i^A(\mathbf{x}_1) \psi_j^B(\mathbf{x}_2) \end{aligned} \quad (b)$$

and so on. Note that odd n states need not be considered because they are not local Lorentz invariant. We shall refer to $F^{(n)}$ as a state of Grassmann number n . n is the eigenvalue of the Weyl charge (as in the integrand in the exponential in (2.ad)) on $F^{(n)}$. The constraint equations (2.100) and (2.101) must be satisfied independently by each term $F^{(n)}[e, \psi]$.

We shall consider the case where $F[e, \psi] \equiv F^{(0)}[e]$ is a functional only of the e^a_i , that is $\delta F^{(0)}/\delta \psi_{Ai} = 0$ (we shall refer to states of this type as “bosonic states”). In this case, any Lorentz invariant state satisfying $\bar{S}^{A'} F^{(0)} = 0$ automatically satisfies all other constraints, since $S^A F^{(0)}$ vanishes identically. A solution of this type was sought in [d93]. We now show that no such solution can exist.

The supersymmetry constraint can be written as [d93]

$$\left[F^{(0)} \right]^{-1} \bar{S} F^{(0)} \equiv -\varepsilon^{ijk} e^a_i \bar{\sigma}_a (D_j \psi_k) + \frac{\hbar \kappa^2}{2} \psi_i \bar{\sigma}^a \frac{\delta(\ln F^{(0)}[e])}{\delta e^a_i} = 0 . \quad (3.9)$$

In this section we shall establish our contradiction by using an integrated form of (3.9) with an arbitrary continuous, commuting, spinor test function $\bar{\epsilon}(\mathbf{x})$:

$$\int d^3\mathbf{x} \bar{\epsilon}(\mathbf{x}) \left[-\varepsilon^{ijk} e^a_i(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\sigma}_a (D_j \psi_k(\mathbf{x})) + \frac{\hbar \kappa^2}{2} \psi_i(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\sigma}^a \frac{\delta(\ln F^{(0)}[e])}{\delta e^a_i(\mathbf{x})} \right] = 0 , \quad (3.10)$$

for all $\bar{\epsilon}(\mathbf{x})$, $e^a_i(\mathbf{x})$, and $\psi_k(\mathbf{x})$. We shall demonstrate that there are no solutions to this version of (3.9). Let the integral in Eq. (3.10) be I , and let $I' = I + \Delta I$ be the integral when $\bar{\epsilon}(\mathbf{x})$ is replaced by $\bar{\epsilon}(\mathbf{x})e^{-\phi(\mathbf{x})}$ and $\psi_i(\mathbf{x})$ is replaced by $\psi_i(\mathbf{x})e^{\phi(\mathbf{x})}$, where $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ is a scalar function. Since $\bar{\epsilon}(\mathbf{x})\psi_i(\mathbf{x})$ is unchanged, the second term (with the functional derivative) cancels in the difference between I' and I , so that

$$\Delta I = - \int d^3\mathbf{x} \varepsilon^{ijk} e^a_i(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\epsilon}(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\sigma}_a \psi_k(\mathbf{x}) \partial_j \phi(\mathbf{x}) = - \int \omega(\mathbf{x}) \wedge d\phi(\mathbf{x}) , \quad (3.a)$$

with the two-form

$$\omega(\mathbf{x}) = \left(\psi_i(\mathbf{x}) dx^i \right) \wedge \left(e^a_j(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\epsilon}(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\sigma}_a dx^j \right) . \quad (3.b)$$

Notice that ΔI is independent of the state $F^{(0)}[e]$. Clearly, it is possible to choose the arbitrary fields $\bar{\epsilon}(\mathbf{x})$, $\phi(\mathbf{x})$, $e^a_i(\mathbf{x})$ and $\psi_k(\mathbf{x})$ such that (3.5) is nonvanishing.

For example, consider the case of a three-torus with each of the three x^i running from 0 to 2π , and let $e^a_i = \delta^a_i$, $\psi_{Ak} = \delta_{A1} \delta_{2k}$, $\bar{\epsilon}_{A'} = -\delta_{A'1} f(\mathbf{x})$, $f = \cos x^1$, $\phi = \sin x^1$. Then

$$\Delta I = \int d^3x f(\mathbf{x}) \partial_1 \phi(\mathbf{x}) = \int d^3x \cos^2(x^1) = 4\pi^3 \neq 0 . \quad (3.c)$$

Clearly, if $\Delta I \neq 0$, we cannot have both $I = 0$ and $I' = 0$, so (3.10) cannot be satisfied for all bosonic $\bar{\epsilon}(\mathbf{x})$, $e^a_i(\mathbf{x})$ and $\psi_k(\mathbf{x})$.

A precisely analogous argument applies to the S^A constraint applied to an anti-holomorphic bosonic wave functional, $\tilde{F}^{(0)}[e^a_i(\mathbf{x}), \bar{\psi}_i(\mathbf{x})] \equiv \tilde{F}^{(0)}[e^a_i]$ independent of $\bar{\psi}_i(\mathbf{x})$. We conclude that bosonic wave functionals of either type are inconsistent with the supersymmetry constraints, contrary to the claims in [d93].

This result suggests that there may also be no states involving a finite nonzero number of fermion fields; that is, that all quantum wave functionals of $N = 1$ supergravity with a finite (zero or nonzero) Grassmann number would be inconsistent with the supersymmetry constraints. We shall return to this question in Sec. 5. In the next section we look at the free spin-3/2 field, and show that in that case all wave functionals solving the gauge

constraints in the appropriate representation necessarily contain an infinite number of fermion fields.

4. THE FREE SPIN-3/2 FIELD

An understanding of the structure of physical states of the free gravitino is a useful prelude to the interacting theory of supergravity. We will discuss the free field from a point of view which resembles the treatment of supergravity in the previous section and in [d84]. The result, that wave functionals which satisfy the constraints must have infinite Grassmann number, suggests that we should anticipate a similar structure in the full theory. In this flat space example, $g_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(+1, -1, -1, -1)$, $\sigma_\mu = (1, \sigma_i)$ and $\varepsilon^{0123} = 1$, and for simplicity we drop the distinction between primed and unprimed spinor indices, using greek letters instead. A perturbative quantization of the free spin-3/2 field has previously been given in [dandas], and its canonical structure is discussed in [pilati] and [senja].

4.1 Constraints

The free Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\bar{\psi}_\mu\sigma_\nu\overleftrightarrow{\partial}_\rho\psi_\sigma \quad (4.1)$$

is gauge invariant under $\delta\psi_\mu = \partial_\mu\epsilon(\mathbf{x})$, with $\epsilon(\mathbf{x})$ an arbitrary two-component spinor. The canonical procedure [d84,pilati] leads to the equal time anti-commutation rules

$$\{\psi_{i\alpha}(\mathbf{x}), \bar{\psi}_{j\beta}(\mathbf{y})\} = \frac{\hbar}{2}\sigma_j\sigma_i\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \equiv -i\hbar D_{\alpha\beta ij}\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) , \quad (4.1a)$$

where $i, j, k = 1, 2, 3$ and these spatial indices are raised and lowered by a metric $h_{ij} = -\delta_{ij}$.

In this section we use Greek letters α, β to denote spinor indices; thus, $D_{\alpha\beta ij} = i\sigma_j\sigma_i/2$

is the flat space version of $D_{AA'ij}$ defined in (2.19). ψ_0 and $\bar{\psi}_0$ are Lagrange multipliers, and their constraints generate time-independent gauge transformations.

In the holomorphic representation, a state of the system has a wave functional $F[\psi]$ with Grassmann variables $\psi_{i\alpha}(\mathbf{x})$, and the operator $\bar{\psi}_{j\beta}(\mathbf{y})$ is represented by

$$\hat{\bar{\psi}}_{j\beta}(\mathbf{y})F[\psi] = -i\hbar D_{ij\alpha\beta} \frac{\delta}{\delta\psi_{i\alpha}} F[\psi] . \quad (4.2)$$

Equivalently, one may use the anti-holomorphic representation, obtained by the fermionic Fourier transformation

$$\tilde{F}[\bar{\psi}] = \int (\prod d\psi_{i\alpha}) \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \exp \int \bar{\psi}_{i\alpha}(\mathbf{y}) C^{ij}_{\alpha\beta} \psi_{j\beta}(\mathbf{y}) d^3\mathbf{y} \right] F[\psi] , \quad (4.3)$$

with $C^{ji}_{\alpha\beta} = \varepsilon^{ijk} \sigma_{k\alpha\beta}$, and $C^{ji}_{\alpha\beta} D_{ik\beta\gamma} = \delta^j_k \delta_{\alpha\gamma}$. In the anti-holomorphic representation ψ acts as

$$\hat{\psi}_{i\alpha} \tilde{F}[\bar{\psi}] = -i\hbar D_{ij\alpha\beta} \frac{\delta}{\delta\bar{\psi}_{j\beta}} \tilde{F}[\bar{\psi}] . \quad (4.4)$$

From now on we shall focus on the holomorphic representation.

Physical states satisfy constraints which may be obtained as the $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ limit of (2.100) and (2.101) or as the $\bar{\psi}_0$ and ψ_0 field equations from (4.1). These constraints are

$$\bar{S}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})F[\psi] = -\varepsilon^{ijk} \sigma_{i\alpha\beta} \partial_j \psi_{k\beta}(\mathbf{x}) F[\psi] = 0 , \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$S_\beta F[\psi] = -\varepsilon^{ijk} \partial_j \bar{\psi}_{k\alpha}(\mathbf{x}) \sigma_{i\alpha\beta} F[\psi] = i\partial_j \frac{\delta}{\delta\psi_{j\beta}} F[\psi] = 0 . \quad (4.6)$$

Note that the constraints satisfy

$$\{\bar{S}_\alpha(\mathbf{x}), S_\beta(\mathbf{y})\} = 0 , \quad (4.6a)$$

in distinction to supergravity where a combination of the Hamiltonian and diffeomorphism constraints appears on the right side of Eq. (2.dd)).

4.2 Mode Decomposition

We shall now proceed to find the general solution of these constraints. As the first step in this process we obtain a set of mode equations whose solutions give a complete orthonormal set of functions suitable for expansion of the initial data for $\psi_{i\alpha}(\mathbf{x})$. The initial-value surface Σ will be taken to be R^3 , but the extension to a 3-torus is immediate. Later we will generalize the mode equations to a 3-manifold with arbitrary metric, embedded in a 3+1 dimensional spacetime. This will give a set of mode functions which can be applied to study the constraints in supergravity.

We decompose $\psi_i(\mathbf{x})$ into spin-3/2 and spin-1/2 parts

$$\psi_{i\alpha}(\mathbf{x}) = \rho_{i\alpha}(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma_{i\alpha\beta}\beta_\beta(\mathbf{x}) , \quad (4.7)$$

where $\rho_i(\mathbf{x})$ is a spinor vector constrained to satisfy

$$\sigma^i \rho_i = 0 . \quad (4.8)$$

The ρ_i and β parts of ψ_i may be projected out by

$$\rho_i(\mathbf{x}) = (\delta_{ij} - \frac{1}{3}\sigma_i\sigma_j)\psi^j(\mathbf{x}), \quad \beta(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{1}{3}\sigma_i\psi^i(\mathbf{x}) . \quad (4.9)$$

Under space-dependent gauge transformations, we have

$$\delta\rho_i = (\partial_i + \frac{1}{3}\sigma_i\sigma^j\partial_j)\epsilon \quad \delta\beta = -\frac{1}{3}\sigma^i\partial_i\epsilon . \quad (4.?)$$

The matrix $-i\hbar D_{ij\alpha\beta}$ in (4.2) has eigenvalue $\hbar$ on $\rho_i(\mathbf{x})$ and eigenvalue $-\hbar/2$ on $\sigma_i\beta(\mathbf{x})$.

One can use this to deduce that

$$\{\rho_{i\alpha}(\mathbf{x}), \bar{\rho}_{j\beta}(\mathbf{y})\} = \hbar \left(\delta_{ij}\delta_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{3}(\sigma_i\sigma_j)_{\alpha\beta} \right) \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) , \quad (4.10)$$

and

$$\{\beta_\alpha(\mathbf{x}), \bar{\beta}_\beta(\mathbf{y})\} = -\frac{\hbar}{6}\delta_{\alpha\beta}\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) , \quad (4.11)$$

with the cross brackets vanishing. It also follows that

$$\tilde{F}[\bar{\rho}, \bar{\beta}] = \int (\prod d\rho_{i\alpha} d\beta_\beta) \exp \int \left[-\frac{1}{\hbar} d^3\mathbf{y} \left(-\bar{\rho}_i \rho_j \delta^{ij} + 6\bar{\beta}\beta \right) \right] F[\rho, \beta] . \quad (4.12)$$

When the decomposition (4.7) is inserted into (4.5), we find that the $\bar{S}$ constraint reads

$$(\partial_i \rho^i + 2\sigma^i \partial_i \beta) F[\rho, \beta] = 0 . \quad (4.15)$$

The corresponding form of the S constraint is

$$(\partial_i \bar{\rho}^i + 2\partial_i \bar{\beta} \sigma^i) F[\rho, \beta] = 0 . \quad (4.16)$$

But (4.10) and (4.11) tell us that, in the holomorphic representation, $\bar{\rho}_i(\mathbf{x})$ and $\bar{\beta}(\mathbf{x})$ are realized by

$$\bar{\rho}_i = \hbar \frac{\delta}{\delta \rho_j} \left(\delta_{ji} - \frac{1}{3} \sigma_j \sigma_i \right), \quad \bar{\beta} = -\frac{\hbar}{6} \frac{\delta}{\delta \beta}, \quad (4.17)$$

so that (4.16) is equivalent to

$$\left[\partial_i \frac{\delta}{\delta \rho_j} \left(\delta_j^i + \frac{1}{3} \sigma_j \sigma^i \right) + \frac{1}{3} \partial_i \frac{\delta}{\delta \beta} \sigma^i \right] F[\rho, \beta] = 0 . \quad (4.18)$$

Now let $\partial = -\sigma^i \partial_i$ denote the Dirac operator on R^3 . Then the Dirac equation

$$i \partial \beta^{(N)} = \lambda_N \beta^{(N)} \quad (4.19)$$

gives a complete set of modes for $\beta(\mathbf{x})$, specifically two modes for each momentum $\mathbf{k}$, with $\lambda = \pm|\mathbf{k}|$. The right mode equation for $\rho_i(\mathbf{x})$ is somewhat trickier. The most general first order equation is

$$i \left[\partial \rho_i^{(n)} + \alpha \sigma_i \partial_j \rho_j^{(n)} \right] = \mu_n \rho_i^{(n)}, \quad (4.20)$$

with real parameter α . Upon contraction with σ^i and use of (4.8), one finds that

$$\left(\alpha - \frac{2}{3} \right) \partial_i \rho^{i(n)} = 0 . \quad (4.21)$$

We cannot accept an additional $\partial \cdot \rho = 0$ constraint on the $\rho_i^{(n)}$ for two reasons. It does not allow the implementation of the gauge transformations (4.?), and it cuts down on the

number of solutions of (4.20). Namely, there are only two solutions of (4.20) for each momentum $\mathbf{k}$, when $\alpha \neq 2/3$, whereas we clearly need four solutions to represent a general configuration for $\rho_i(\mathbf{x})$. Therefore we choose $\alpha = 2/3$, and the mode equation

$$i \left[\partial \rho_i^{(n)} + \frac{2}{3} \sigma_i \partial_j \rho^{j(n)} \right] = \mu_n \rho_i^{(n)} . \quad (4.22)$$

It is easy to show that the operator on the left side is self-adjoint with respect to the natural scalar product

$$\int d^3 \mathbf{x} \bar{\rho}^i(\mathbf{x}) \delta_{ij} \rho^j(\mathbf{x}) , \quad (4.23)$$

for fields satisfying $\sigma^i \rho_i = 0$.

One may distinguish two classes of solutions to equation (4.22). There are “pure gauges” which are related to the $\beta^{(N)}$ modes by

$$\tilde{\rho}_i^{(N)} = \frac{i}{\lambda_N} \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\partial_i - \frac{1}{3} \sigma_i \partial \right) \beta^{(N)} , \quad (4.24)$$

and have eigenvalues $\tilde{\mu}_N = \lambda_N/3$, with two such modes for each $\mathbf{k}$. There is also a set of modes $\hat{\rho}_i^{(N)}$, again two for each $\mathbf{k}$, which are orthogonal to all pure gauges and thus satisfy $\partial_i \hat{\rho}^{i(N)} = 0$ in addition to (4.8) and (4.22).² It is the $\hat{\rho}_i^{(N)}$ modes which describe the physical helicity $\pm 3/2$ excitations of the system. For completeness we present the full set of normalized solutions of our mode equations in terms of helicity spinors $\chi^\pm(\mathbf{k})$ and circular polarization vectors $\varepsilon_i^a(\mathbf{k})$, with $a = 0, \pm$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_i^{(\pm, \mathbf{k})}(\mathbf{x}) &= e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \left(\mp \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \chi^\mp(\mathbf{k}) \varepsilon_i^\pm(\mathbf{k}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \chi^\pm(\mathbf{k}) \varepsilon_i^0(\mathbf{k}) \right) , & \mu &= \pm \frac{1}{3} |\mathbf{k}| \\ \hat{\rho}_i^{(\pm, \mathbf{k})}(\mathbf{x}) &= e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \chi^\pm(\mathbf{k}) \varepsilon_i^\pm(\mathbf{k}) , & \mu &= \pm |\mathbf{k}| \\ \beta^{(\pm, \mathbf{k})}(\mathbf{x}) &= e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \chi^\pm(\mathbf{k}) , & \lambda &= \pm |\mathbf{k}| \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

where if, for example, $\mathbf{k} = (0, 0, k)$, then

$$\varepsilon_i^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (1, \pm i, 0), \quad \varepsilon_i^0 = (0, 0, 1), \quad \chi^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \chi^- = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} . \quad (4.25a)$$

² For every eigenvalue, there are two $\tilde{\rho}$ modes, two $\hat{\rho}$ modes, and two β modes. We therefore use uppercase superscripts (N) to index all of these sets; lowercase superscripts (n) are used to index the entire collection of ρ modes.

For general momenta, $\varepsilon_i(\mathbf{k})$ and $\chi(\mathbf{k})$ are obtained from these expressions by rotations.

Note that the modes are normalized so that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_n \rho_i^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\rho}_j^{(n)}(\mathbf{y}) &= \left(\delta_{ij} - \frac{1}{3} \sigma_i \sigma_j \right) \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \\ \sum_n \beta^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\beta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{y}) &= \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) , \end{aligned} \quad (4.25b)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^3\mathbf{x} \bar{\rho}^{(n)i}(\mathbf{x}) \delta_{ij} \rho^{(m)j}(\mathbf{x}) &= \delta_{mn} \\ \int d^3\mathbf{x} \bar{\beta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \beta^{(M)}(\mathbf{x}) &= \delta_{MN} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.25c)$$

On the initial value surface the ρ_i and β parts of ψ_i can be expanded in the mode system as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_i(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_N \left[\tilde{r}_N \tilde{\rho}_i^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) + \hat{r}_N \hat{\rho}_i^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \right] , \\ \beta(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_N b_N \beta^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

where $\tilde{r}_N$, $\hat{r}_N$ and b_N are Grassmann numbers, while

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta}{\delta \rho_j(\mathbf{x})} &= - \sum_N \left[\tilde{\rho}^{j(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\delta}{\delta \tilde{r}_N} + \hat{\rho}^{j(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\delta}{\delta \hat{r}_N} \right] \\ \frac{\delta}{\delta \beta(\mathbf{x})} &= \sum_N \bar{\beta}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\delta}{\delta b_N} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

In this mode basis we can replace the wave functional $F[\psi]$ by $F[\tilde{r}_N, \hat{r}_N, b_N]$. This representation is, as we shall see below, equivalent to a Fock space representation.

Finally, we remark that in [d93], D'Eath presented a decomposition of $\psi_{i\alpha}(\mathbf{x})$ in terms of a spinor $\beta_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ and a totally symmetric tri-spinor $\gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(\mathbf{x})$. He then specified mode equations for β and γ for a general initial-value surface Σ . The equations are easy to solve for flat Σ , and results can be compared with ours. One finds that his $\gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^{(n)}$ modes satisfy a constraint analogous to (4.21) and that there are only two $\gamma^{(n)}$ modes for each momentum $\mathbf{k}$. So the mode equations presented in [d93] do not lead to a general solution of the initial value problem for $\psi_{i\alpha}(\mathbf{x})$, although it is possible that they can be modified to eliminate

the unwanted constraint. Certainly our decomposition (4.9) and mode equations (4.19) and (4.22) are not unique, but any correct choice must produce six independent modes for every momentum $\mathbf{k}$.

4.3 Physical states

Using the relation (4.24) between β and $\tilde{\rho}$ modes, and mode orthogonality, one can see that the constraints (4.15) and (4.18) become

$$\left[\tilde{r}_N - \sqrt{6}b_N \right] F = 0 , \quad \forall N \neq 0 , \quad (4.28)$$

and

$$\left[\frac{\delta}{\delta \tilde{r}_N} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{\delta}{\delta b_N} \right] F = 0 , \quad \forall N \neq 0 , \quad (4.29)$$

where the modes with eigenvalue $\lambda_0 \equiv 0$ and $\tilde{\mu}_0 \equiv 0$ drop out of the constraint. The most general physical state functional is then

$$F = \left[\prod_M \left(\frac{\tilde{r}_M}{\sqrt{6}} - b_M \right) \right] f[\hat{r}_N, \tilde{r}_0, b_0] , \quad (4.30)$$

where the infinite product extends over all non-zero modes and $f[\hat{r}_N, \tilde{r}_0, b_0]$ is an arbitrary function of the indicated Grassmann variables. Here $\tilde{r}_0$ and b_0 denote the Grassmann coefficients corresponding to zero modes. In what follows, we shall ignore the dependence on these zero modes, since in flat space free field theory, they are usually thrown away. On the torus these modes are of course present, and may be of importance.

In order to make contact with standard Fock space quantization methods, it is now useful to convert r_n and $\bar{r}_n$ into conventional creation and annihilation operators. We define

$$c_{\mathbf{k}} = \hat{r}_{(+,\mathbf{k})}, \quad d_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger = \hat{r}_{(-,\mathbf{k})}, \quad d_{\mathbf{k}} = \hat{\bar{r}}_{(-,\mathbf{k})}, \quad c_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger = \hat{\bar{r}}_{(+,\mathbf{k})} . \quad (4.1aa)$$

where the dagger is just notation, since we have not yet defined an inner product on physical states. They obey the anti-commutation relations

$$\{c_{\mathbf{k}}, c_{\mathbf{k}'}^\dagger\} = \delta_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} , \quad \{d_{\mathbf{k}}, d_{\mathbf{k}'}^\dagger\} = \delta_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} , \quad (4.1ab)$$

with all others zero. Clearly, in our chosen representation,

$$d_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{\delta}{\delta d_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger} , \quad c_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger = \frac{\delta}{\delta c_{\mathbf{k}}} . \quad (4.1ac)$$

We may now compute the Hamiltonian. In terms of the fields $\psi(\mathbf{x})$ and $\bar{\psi}(\mathbf{x})$, this takes the form

$$H = \int d^3\mathbf{x} \left(\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{ijk} (\partial_i \bar{\psi}_k) \psi_j - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{ijk} \bar{\psi}_k \partial_i \psi_j + \bar{\psi}_0 \left[\varepsilon^{ijk} \sigma_i \partial_j \psi_k \right] - \psi_0 \left[\varepsilon^{ijk} \partial_j \bar{\psi}_k \sigma_i \right] \right) \quad (4.1ad)$$

In terms of the operators b_N , c_N and d_N and their conjugates, it becomes

$$H = \sum_{\pm, \mathbf{k}} |\mathbf{k}| \left[\frac{\delta}{\delta c_{\mathbf{k}}} c_{\mathbf{k}} + d_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \frac{\delta}{\delta d_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger} \right] , \quad (4.1ae)$$

up to a zero-point constant and terms proportional to the constraints. At this stage, we may effectively ignore the infinite product in (4.30), since it commutes with the Hamiltonian, and regard a state as being defined by its $f[\hat{r}_N]$ part. In terms of the new variables, f is a function of the $c_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $d_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger$.

We may now construct the usual Fock states, starting with the vacuum state $f_0[c_{\mathbf{k}}, d_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger]$, which is

$$f_0 = \prod_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}} , \quad (4.1af)$$

so that $c_{\mathbf{k}} f_0 = 0$ and $\delta f_0 / \delta d_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger = 0$, $\forall \mathbf{k}$. A state with a single excitation is created by $c_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \equiv \delta / \delta c_{\mathbf{k}}$ as $f_{(+, \mathbf{k})} = \delta f_0 / \delta c_{\mathbf{k}}$, or by $d_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger$ as $f_{(-, \mathbf{k})} = d_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger f_0$, showing the Fock character of the state space. The infinite product of $c_{\mathbf{k}}$'s in the vacuum state represents the filling of the Dirac sea. The “bare” vacuum, $f_0 = 1$, is annihilated by the $c_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger$, and has negative

energy excitations created by multiplication by $c_{\mathbf{k}}$, while the true vacuum, with its infinite product of $c_{\mathbf{k}}$'s, has all these negative energy states filled. A similar result applies in the anti-holomorphic representation, where the vacuum state $\tilde{f}_0[c_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger, d_{\mathbf{k}}]$ has an infinite product of $d_{\mathbf{k}}$'s.

Our main conclusion in this section is that all physical states must have the form (4.30), and therefore have infinite Grassmann number. This statement is independent of the problem of defining an inner product on the space of states, but we now discuss this issue briefly. The natural inner product appropriate for holomorphic quantization is [d84, fadslav]

$$\langle F|G\rangle = \int (\prod d\psi d\bar{\psi}) \tilde{F}[\bar{\psi}] \exp \left[-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int d^3\mathbf{y} \bar{\psi} C \psi \right] G[\psi] . \quad (4.31)$$

In the mode number basis this becomes

$$\langle F|G\rangle = \int \prod_N d\hat{r}_N d\tilde{r}_N db_N d\tilde{r}_N^\dagger d\bar{b}_N d\hat{r}_N^\dagger \tilde{F} \exp \left[\frac{1}{\hbar} \sum_N \left(\hat{r}_N^\dagger \hat{r}_N + \tilde{r}_N^\dagger \tilde{r}_N - 6\bar{b}_N b_N \right) \right] G . \quad (4.32)$$

The minus sign in front of the $\bar{b}_N b_N$ term means that the metric is indefinite, as required by (4.11).

Direct computation reveals that this inner product vanishes on all physical states, due to the prefactor in (4.30), its anti-holomorphic analogue, and the form of the exponential in (4.32). This is expected in a constrained system, since the inner product involves integration over gauge degrees of freedom on which physical states do not depend. In bosonic theories, the inner product is infinite on all states unless this overcounting is eliminated [cs]. In the case at hand, (4.32) includes Berezin integrations over all unphysical modes, which gives zero rather than infinity.

We can remedy this by introducing a gauge-fixing condition for space dependent gauge transformations into the functional integrals (4.31) or (4.32), in the form of a delta function [cs]. There are many choices for a gauge fixing condition — for example, we might wish to

choose the condition $\partial_i \rho^i - 2\sigma^i \partial_i \beta = 0$ and its conjugate, which have non-vanishing Dirac brackets with the constraints. A delta function imposing these conditions inserts an infinite product of $(\tilde{r}_N + \sqrt{6}b_N)$ and their hermitian conjugates into (4.32). It is straightforward to see that the new inner product with this delta function included has the correct norm on the Fock states. For example, the vacuum state $F_0 = [\prod_M (\tilde{r}_M / \sqrt{6} - b_M)] f_0$ has norm 1.

5. PHYSICAL STATES IN N=1 SUPERGRAVITY

In this section, we shall discuss the fermionic dependence of states satisfying $\bar{S}^{A'} F = 0$, where $F[e, \psi]$ is not purely bosonic. We shall examine separately states $F^{(n)}[e, \psi]$, with Grassmann number n , according to the decomposition introduced in Sec. 3. We write the constraint (2.100) acting on $F^{(n)}$ as

$$\epsilon^{ijk} e^a{}_i(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\sigma}_a [D_j \psi_k(\mathbf{x})] F^{(n)}[e, \psi] - \frac{\hbar \kappa^2}{2} \bar{\sigma}^a \psi_i(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\delta F^{(n)}[e, \psi]}{\delta e^a{}_i(\mathbf{x})} = 0 . \quad (c)$$

States representing an odd number of fermions do not satisfy the Lorentz constraint, so we shall only consider states with an even Grassmann number. The aim of this section is to show that no finite- n state can satisfy (c), a result consistent with our findings for the free spin-3/2 field.

5.1 Mode expansion in curved space

In order to discuss states of definite Grassmann number, it is convenient to introduce a decomposition of the fields ψ_i and $\bar{\psi}_i$ in a similar way to that used in flat space in section 4. However, in curved space it is useful to define

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{iA}{}^B \equiv n^a e^b{}_i (\sigma_a \bar{\sigma}_b)_A{}^B \quad (5.aac)$$

to replace the flat space sigma matrices. Note that $\tilde{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{x})$ depends on the $e^a_i(\mathbf{x})$. In flat space, where $e^a_i = \delta^a_i$ and $n^a = (1, 0, 0, 0)$, $\tilde{\sigma}_i$ is an ordinary sigma matrix. In general, the $\tilde{\sigma}_i$ share many identities with the flat space sigma-matrices, the most useful being:

$$\tilde{\sigma}_i \tilde{\sigma}_j = -h_{ij} + i\sqrt{-h}\varepsilon_{ijk}\tilde{\sigma}^k, \quad \tilde{\sigma}^i \tilde{\sigma}^j = -h^{ij} + \frac{i}{\sqrt{-h}}\varepsilon^{ijk}\tilde{\sigma}_k. \quad (5.ad)$$

Using $\tilde{\sigma}_i$, we can write

$$\psi_k = \rho_k + \tilde{\sigma}_k \beta, \quad (5.1)$$

with $\tilde{\sigma}^k \rho_k = 0$. The space of functions $\rho_k(\mathbf{x})$ and $\beta(\mathbf{x})$ are spanned by solutions of the curved space versions of (4.19) and (4.20),

$$i\tilde{\sigma}^i D_i \rho_j^{(n)} - \frac{2}{3}i\tilde{\sigma}_j D_i \rho^{i(n)} = \mu_n \rho_j^{(n)} \quad (5.2)$$

and

$$i\tilde{\sigma}^i D_i \beta^{(M)} = \lambda_M \beta^{(M)}. \quad (5.3)$$

Here the modes $\rho_i^{(m)}$ and $\beta^{(M)}$ are normalized so that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_n \rho_{Ai}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\rho}_{A'j}^{(n)}(\mathbf{y}) &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{-h}} \left(h_{ij} \delta_A^C - \frac{1}{3}(\tilde{\sigma}_i \tilde{\sigma}_j)_A^C \right) \sigma_{CA'}^a n_a \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \\ \sum_M \beta_A^{(M)}(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\beta}_{A'}^{(M)}(\mathbf{y}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{-h}} \sigma_{AA'}^a n_a \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}), \end{aligned} \quad (5.ae)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} - \int d^3\mathbf{x} \sqrt{-h} \bar{\rho}_{A'i}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) h^{ij}(\mathbf{x}) \rho_{Aj}^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\sigma}_a^{A'A} n^a &= \delta_{mn} \\ \int d^3\mathbf{x} \sqrt{-h} \bar{\beta}_{A'}^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \beta_A^{(M)}(\mathbf{x}) \bar{\sigma}_a^{A'A} n^a &= \delta_{MN}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.af)$$

Note that the first mode equation implies the relation

$$\frac{i}{3} \tilde{\sigma}^k D_k (D_i \rho^{i(n)}) + \frac{3i}{2} R_{ik} \tilde{\sigma}^k \rho^{i(n)} = \mu_n (D_i \rho^{i(n)}), \quad (5.4)$$

so that $D_i \rho^i$ satisfies a β -type equation only on a surface of constant curvature $R_{ij} = K h_{ij}$.

Having defined the quantity $\tilde{\sigma}_i$, it is useful to rewrite the constraint equation (c), multiplied by $n^a \sigma_a$, as

$$\varepsilon^{ijk} \tilde{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{x}) D_j \psi_k(\mathbf{x}) F^{(n)}[e, \psi] - \frac{\hbar \kappa^2}{2} n_a(\mathbf{x}) \sigma^a \bar{\sigma}^b \psi_i(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\delta F^{(n)}[e, \psi]}{\delta e^b_i(\mathbf{x})} = 0. \quad (5.c)$$

Inserting the decomposition (5.1) for ψ_k into the constraint (5.c), we find that the coefficient of $F^{(n)}$ in the first term of the constraint becomes

$$\varepsilon^{ijk}\tilde{\sigma}_i D_j \psi_k = 2i\sqrt{-h}\tilde{\sigma}^j D_j \beta - i\sqrt{-h}D_j \rho^j . \quad (5.5)$$

A general gravitino field may be written in terms of the modes $\rho_i^{(m)}$ and $\beta^{(M)}$ as

$$\psi_i(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_m r_m \rho_i^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_M b_M \tilde{\sigma}_i \beta^{(M)}(\mathbf{x}) . \quad (5.ag)$$

This allows us to write each $F^{(n)}$ in terms of modes; for example, $F^{(2)}$ of (b) becomes

$$F^{(2)}[e, r, b] = r_m r_n K_{mn}[e] + r_m b_N K_{mN}[e] + b_M b_N K_{MN}[e] , \quad (f)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} 2K_{mn}[e] &= \int d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{y} K^{(2)}[e, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]^{ij} \left(\rho_i^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}) \rho_j^{(n)}(\mathbf{y}) - m \leftrightarrow n \right) \\ K_{mN}[e] &= \int d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{y} K^{(2)}[e, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]^{ij} \left(\rho_i^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}) \tilde{\sigma}_j(\mathbf{y}) \beta^{(N)}(\mathbf{y}) - \tilde{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{x}) \beta^{(N)}(\mathbf{x}) \rho_j^{(m)}(\mathbf{y}) \right) \\ 2K_{MN}[e] &= \int d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{y} K^{(2)}[e, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]^{ij} \left(\tilde{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{x}) \beta^{(M)}(\mathbf{x}) \tilde{\sigma}_j(\mathbf{y}) \beta^{(N)}(\mathbf{y}) - M \leftrightarrow N \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (g)$$

with $K^{(2)}[e, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]^{ij}$ defined in (b). Similar expressions apply for each $F^{(n)}$. Furthermore, we obtain a mode decomposition of the functional derivatives $\delta F^{(n)}/\delta e(\mathbf{x})$ by taking the derivative of (b) with respect to the dreibein and then expanding ψ . Thus,

$$\frac{\delta F^{(2)}}{\delta e_k(\mathbf{z})}[e, r, b] = r_m r_n \frac{\Delta K_{mn}}{\delta e_k(\mathbf{z})}[e] + r_m b_N \frac{\Delta K_{mN}}{\delta e_k(\mathbf{z})}[e] + b_M b_N \frac{\Delta K_{MN}}{\delta e_k(\mathbf{z})}[e] , \quad (h)$$

where

$$\frac{\Delta K_{mn}}{\delta e_k(\mathbf{z})}[e] = \frac{1}{2} \int d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{y} \frac{\delta K^{(2)}[e, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]^{ij}}{\delta e_k(\mathbf{z})} \left(\rho_i^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}) \rho_j^{(n)}(\mathbf{y}) - \rho_i^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \rho_j^{(m)}(\mathbf{y}) \right) , \quad (i)$$

and so on. It is important to specify that we first take the functional derivative, then expand in modes; since the definition of the modes depends on the dreibein, these operations do not commute. The notation $\Delta K_{mn}/\delta e$ serves as a reminder that this quantity is not equal to $\delta K_{mn}/\delta e$.

Now we may write the constraint (5.c) in terms of sums over the modes. A bosonic state will satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} & r_m \left(\frac{i}{\sqrt{-h}} D_i \rho^{(m)i}(\mathbf{x}) F^{(0)}[e] + \frac{\hbar \kappa^2}{2} n_a(\mathbf{x}) \sigma^a \bar{\sigma}^b \rho_i^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\delta F^{(0)}[e]}{\delta e^{b_i}(\mathbf{x})} \right) + \\ & b_M \left(-2\sqrt{-h} \lambda_M \beta^{(M)} F^{(0)}[e] + \frac{\hbar \kappa^2}{2} n_a(\mathbf{x}) \sigma^a \bar{\sigma}^b \tilde{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{x}) \beta^{(M)}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\delta F^{(0)}[e]}{\delta e^{b_i}(\mathbf{x})} \right) = 0 , \end{aligned} \quad (j)$$

while the state with Grassmann number 2 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & r_m r_n r_l \left(\frac{i}{\sqrt{-h}} D_i \rho^{(m)i}(\mathbf{x}) K_{nl}[e] + \frac{\hbar \kappa^2}{2} n_a(\mathbf{x}) \sigma^a \bar{\sigma}^b \rho_i^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\Delta K_{nl}}{\delta e^{b_i}(\mathbf{x})}[e] \right) \\ & + b_M b_N b_L \left(-2\sqrt{-h} \lambda_M \beta^{(M)}(\mathbf{x}) K_{NL}[e] + \frac{\hbar \kappa^2}{2} n_a(\mathbf{x}) \sigma^a \bar{\sigma}^b \tilde{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{x}) \beta^{(M)}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\Delta K_{NL}}{\delta e^{b_i}(\mathbf{x})}[e] \right) \\ & + r_m r_n b_L \left(\frac{i}{\sqrt{-h}} D_i \rho^{(m)i}(\mathbf{x}) K_{nL}[e] + \frac{\hbar \kappa^2}{2} n_a(\mathbf{x}) \sigma^a \bar{\sigma}^b \rho_i^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\Delta K_{nL}}{\delta e^{b_i}(\mathbf{x})}[e] \right. \\ & \left. - 2\sqrt{-h} \lambda_L \beta^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}) K_{mn}[e] + \frac{\hbar \kappa^2}{2} n_a(\mathbf{x}) \sigma^a \bar{\sigma}^b \tilde{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{x}) \beta^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\Delta K_{mn}}{\delta e^{b_i}(\mathbf{x})}[e] \right) \\ & + r_m b_N b_L \left(\frac{i}{\sqrt{-h}} D_i \rho^{(m)i}(\mathbf{x}) K_{NL}[e] + \frac{\hbar \kappa^2}{2} n_a(\mathbf{x}) \sigma^a \bar{\sigma}^b \rho_i^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\Delta K_{NL}}{\delta e^{b_i}(\mathbf{x})}[e] \right. \\ & \left. - 2\sqrt{-h} \lambda_L \beta^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}) K_{mN}[e] + \frac{\hbar \kappa^2}{2} n_a(\mathbf{x}) \sigma^a \bar{\sigma}^b \tilde{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{x}) \beta^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\Delta K_{mN}}{\delta e^{b_i}(\mathbf{x})}[e] \right) = 0 . \end{aligned} \quad (k)$$

It is straightforward to obtain the equivalent expression for any $F^{(n)}$. Since the coefficients r_m and b_M are arbitrary, the (appropriately antisymmetrized) expressions in parentheses must vanish independently. Our goal is to use this fact to show that each of the coefficients $K_{m_1 m_2 \dots M_{n-1} M_n}$ vanish, and hence that each $K^{(n)}$ vanishes.

5.2 The bosonic sector

We begin by considering the bosonic sector, which we have already shown in Sec. 2 to have no non-zero solution to the constraint $\bar{S}^{A'} F^{(0)} = 0$, on the basis of a scaling argument. Here we shall proceed from (j), in order to introduce a method which generalizes to states with nonzero Grassmann number. In (j), the coefficient of b_M must be zero (for each value

of M), or

$$2\sqrt{-\hbar}\lambda_M\beta^{(M)}(\mathbf{x})F^{(0)}[e] - \frac{\hbar\kappa^2}{2}n_a(\mathbf{x})\sigma^a\bar{\sigma}^b\tilde{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{x})\beta^{(M)}(\mathbf{x})\frac{\delta F^{(0)}[e]}{\delta e^b_i(\mathbf{x})} = 0 , \quad (l)$$

where there is no sum on M . We shall prove that this implies that $F^{(0)}$ is identically zero by taking linear (functional) combinations of this equation for different M , in order to eliminate functional derivatives of $F^{(0)}$. Then we show that the linear combination of the remaining terms is a non-vanishing function multiplying $F^{(0)}$. From this we deduce that $F^{(0)}$ vanishes.

The coefficients with which we multiply equation (l) for different modes M are encoded in a *mode-killing* function $V_M(\mathbf{x})$, indexed by M . It is enough to consider linear combinations of (l) for a set of three modes $\beta^{(M)}(\mathbf{x})$ in order to define $V_M(\mathbf{x})$ (although considering larger sets of modes is permissible). The mode killer is orthogonal to the $\beta_A^{(M)}(\mathbf{x})$ (where we have restored the spinor index) for each $A = 1, 2$ in the sense that

$$\sum_{M=1,2,3} \bar{V}_M(\mathbf{x})\beta_A^{(M)}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 . \quad (m)$$

Multiplying (l) for the three modes by the mode killer serves to remove the term involving $\delta F/\delta e$, leaving

$$\left(\sum_{M=1,2,3} \bar{V}_M(\mathbf{x})\lambda_M\beta_A^{(M)}(\mathbf{x}) \right) F^{(0)}[e] = 0 . \quad (n)$$

It is easy to check that the function in brackets does not vanish identically, as long as the three eigenvalues λ_M are not all equal, and we are free to choose three modes for which this is the case. Thus, we find that $F^{(0)}$ itself must vanish.

5.3 States with nonzero Grassmann number

We next turn to states with nonzero Grassmann number. The procedure in this case is essentially the same for all n , although the notation quickly becomes unwieldy. We

shall illustrate the method for $n = 2$, and simply outline the extension to larger n . We begin with the coefficient of $b_M b_N b_L$ in (k); the antisymmetric part must vanish, which we express as the sum of cyclic permutations:

$$2\sqrt{-\hbar}\lambda_M\beta_A^{(M)}(\mathbf{x})K_{NL}[e] - \frac{\hbar\kappa^2}{2}n_a(\mathbf{x})\sigma^a\bar{\sigma}^b\tilde{\sigma}_{iA}{}^B(\mathbf{x})\beta_B^{(M)}(\mathbf{x})\frac{\Delta K_{NL}}{\delta e^b{}_i(\mathbf{x})}[e] + \{NLM\} + \{LMN\} = 0 \quad (o)$$

We shall again use mode-killing functions to remove functional derivatives of K . In the case of non-zero Grassmann number states, we shall find that more than one mode-killing function is required. It is easy to see, for example, that contracting in $\bar{V}_M(\mathbf{x})$ will not make the NLM or LMN terms with functional derivatives vanish. If we contract over N using the same $\bar{V}_N(\mathbf{x})$, then the antisymmetry implies that the whole of (o) vanishes. Thus we require enough modes that we can define (in this case) three different mode killers. The requisite number of modes is then 5, *i.e.* $M = 1, \dots, 5$. (Again, a larger number would be allowed.) We therefore introduce a new index α labeling different mode-killing functions: $V_M^\alpha(\mathbf{x})$. For the sector with Grassmann number n , we require $n+1$ mode killers, $\alpha = 1, \dots, n+1$, and so M runs over the range $1, \dots, n+3$.

Returning to the case of Grassmann number 2, contracting in the three different mode killers, we kill off the terms with functional derivatives, to obtain

$$\bar{V}_M^{[\alpha}(\mathbf{x})\bar{V}_N^\beta(\mathbf{x})\bar{V}_L^{\gamma]}(\mathbf{x})\left(\lambda_M\beta_A^{(M)}(\mathbf{x})K_{NL}[e]\right) = 0, \quad (p)$$

where a sum over M , N , and L is implied, and square brackets denote antisymmetrization (the antisymmetrization over M , N and L has been replaced by an equivalent antisymmetrization over α , β and γ).

We now define

$$U_A^\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \bar{V}_M^\alpha(\mathbf{x})\lambda_M\beta_A^{(M)}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (q)$$

and

$$G^{\beta\gamma}(\mathbf{x}) = \bar{V}_N^{[\beta}(\mathbf{x})\bar{V}_L^{\gamma]}(\mathbf{x})K_{NL}[e], \quad (r)$$

which may be thought as a one-form and two-form in a 3-dimensional space. The constraint (p) can now be written compactly as the wedge product condition

$$U_A^{[\alpha}(\mathbf{x})G^{\beta\gamma]}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 . \quad (s)$$

The wedge orthogonality conditions (s) imply that the coefficients $K_{NL}[e]$ must vanish. To show this we “rotate” the forms U and G by an $\mathbf{x}$ -dependent $SU(3)$ matrix Λ :

$$\begin{aligned} U_A^{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x}) &= \Lambda_\alpha^{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x})U_A^\alpha(\mathbf{x}) \\ G^{\beta'\gamma'}(\mathbf{x}) &= \Lambda_\beta^{\beta'}(\mathbf{x})\Lambda_\gamma^{\gamma'}(\mathbf{x})G^{\beta\gamma}(\mathbf{x}) , \end{aligned} \quad (u)$$

choosing Λ such that $U_1^{2'}(\mathbf{x}) = U_1^{3'}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$. This leaves enough freedom in the choice of Λ that we may also make the single component $U_2^{3'}(\mathbf{x})$ vanish, so that we have

$$U_1^{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x}) = \Lambda_\alpha^{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x})U_1^\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} \times \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad U_2^{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x}) = \Lambda_\alpha^{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x})U_2^\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} \times \\ \times \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.70)$$

Then Eq. (s) implies

$$G^{2'3'}(\mathbf{x}) = G^{3'1'}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 . \quad (v)$$

We can write these two relations as

$$G^{2'3'}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \sum_{N, L} Q_{NL}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})K_{NL}[e] = 0, \quad G^{3'1'}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \sum_{N, L} Q_{NL}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})K_{NL}[e] = 0, \quad (w)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{NL}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) &= \Lambda_\beta^{2'}(\mathbf{x})\Lambda_\gamma^{3'}(\mathbf{x})\bar{V}_N^{[\beta}(\mathbf{x})\bar{V}_L^{\gamma]}(\mathbf{x}) , \\ Q_{NL}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) &= \Lambda_\beta^{1'}(\mathbf{x})\Lambda_\gamma^{3'}(\mathbf{x})\bar{V}_N^{[\beta}(\mathbf{x})\bar{V}_L^{\gamma]}(\mathbf{x}) . \end{aligned} \quad (w2)$$

We now recall from the discussion below (o) that we are working with a set of 5 β -modes $\beta_A^{(M)}(\mathbf{x})$, $M = 1, \dots, 5$. The 3 associated mode killers $\bar{V}_M^\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ can be chosen to satisfy (m), with non-vanishing components taking the form

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{V}^1(\mathbf{x}) &= (\bar{V}_1^1(\mathbf{x}), & 0, & 0, & \bar{V}_4^1(\mathbf{x}), & \bar{V}_5^1(\mathbf{x})) \\ \bar{V}^2(\mathbf{x}) &= (0, & \bar{V}_2^2(\mathbf{x}), & 0, & \bar{V}_4^2(\mathbf{x}), & \bar{V}_5^2(\mathbf{x})) . \\ \bar{V}^3(\mathbf{x}) &= (0, & 0, & \bar{V}_3^3(\mathbf{x}), & \bar{V}_4^3(\mathbf{x}), & \bar{V}_5^3(\mathbf{x})) \end{aligned} \quad (5.aa)$$

Each non-zero component is a function of $\mathbf{x}$ which is non-vanishing in some compact subset $\Sigma' \in \Sigma$.

We now make two plausible technical assumptions which we cannot fully prove for a general hypersurface Σ . We will then complete the general argument using these assumptions and then show that the assumptions are valid when Σ is flat. We assume the following:

(a) The modes $\beta_A^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})$, $\beta_A^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})$ are chosen arbitrarily, and the $\beta_A^{(M)}(\mathbf{x})$, $M = 3, 4, 5$ may then be chosen so that $Q_{12}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})$ is a function which in Σ' is linearly independent of the other $Q_{NL}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})$ in (w), and similarly $Q_{12}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})$ is linearly independent of the other $Q_{NL}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})$.

(b) All six components of $U_A^\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ are nonvanishing in Σ' . This may be arranged by further change in the modes $\beta_A^{(M)}(\mathbf{x})$, $M = 3, 4, 5$, if required. One can show that this means that no row of the matrix Λ can have two vanishing elements, which will be required below.

Assumption (a) means that the terms with coefficient K_{12} in $G^{2'3'}(\mathbf{x})$ and $G^{1'3'}(\mathbf{x})$ in (w) must vanish separately. We will now show that this can only happen if $K_{12} = 0$. Since the modes called $\beta_A^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\beta_A^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})$ were chosen arbitrarily, all of the K_{NL} must vanish by similar arguments. Using (5.aa), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{12}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) &= (\Lambda_1^{2'}(\mathbf{x})\Lambda_2^{3'}(\mathbf{x}) - \Lambda_2^{2'}(\mathbf{x})\Lambda_1^{3'}(\mathbf{x}))\bar{V}_1^1(\mathbf{x})\bar{V}_2^2(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \Lambda^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})\bar{V}_1^1(\mathbf{x})\bar{V}_2^2(\mathbf{x}) , \\ Q_{12}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) &= (\Lambda_1^{1'}(\mathbf{x})\Lambda_2^{3'}(\mathbf{x}) - \Lambda_2^{1'}(\mathbf{x})\Lambda_1^{3'}(\mathbf{x}))\bar{V}_1^1(\mathbf{x})\bar{V}_2^2(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \Lambda^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})\bar{V}_1^1(\mathbf{x})\bar{V}_2^2(\mathbf{x}) . \end{aligned} \tag{w3}$$

where $\Lambda^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\Lambda^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})$ are determinants of certain 2×2 submatrices of $\Lambda_\alpha^{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x})$. Since $\bar{V}_1^1(\mathbf{x})\bar{V}_2^2(\mathbf{x})$ is nonzero by hypothesis, we need to show that the two determinants $\Lambda^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\Lambda^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})$ cannot simultaneously vanish. We give a somewhat abstract discussion, in anticipation of the higher- n case considered below. We consider the first two components of the three rows of $\Lambda_\alpha^{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x})$ to define three one-forms $\theta^i(\mathbf{x})$ in a two-dimensional space:

$$\Lambda_\alpha^{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x}) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \theta^1(\mathbf{x}) & . \\ \hline \theta^2(\mathbf{x}) & . \\ \hline \theta^3(\mathbf{x}) & . \end{array} \right) \tag{5.71}$$

Thus, the two components of $\theta^1(\mathbf{x})$ are $(\Lambda_1^{1'}(\mathbf{x}), \Lambda_2^{1'}(\mathbf{x}))$. In this notation, the determinants $\Lambda^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\Lambda^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})$ will only vanish if $\theta^2(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \theta^3(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ and $\theta^1(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \theta^3(\mathbf{x}) = 0$, respectively;

we shall assume this is true and derive a contradiction. None of the $\theta^i(\mathbf{x})$ can be identically zero, since none of the rows of $\Lambda_\alpha^{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x})$ has two zero elements. Therefore we must have $\theta^1(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \theta^2(\mathbf{x}) = 0$, and hence $\Lambda^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \Lambda_1^{1'}(\mathbf{x})\Lambda_2^{2'}(\mathbf{x}) - \Lambda_2^{1'}(\mathbf{x})\Lambda_1^{2'}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$. This in turn implies that $\text{Det } \Lambda = 0$, which is impossible for $\Lambda \in \text{SU}(3)$. Thus, either $\Lambda^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})$ or $\Lambda^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})$ must be nonzero, and hence K_{12} must vanish in order to satisfy (w). Since there were no special properties of the specific modes $\beta^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\beta^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})$ used in this demonstration, all of the K_{NL} coefficients will vanish by similar arguments.

Having shown that $K_{NL} = 0$ subject to assumptions (a) and (b) as stated below (5.aa), we now demonstrate that these assumptions hold in flat space. In this case the modes $\beta^{(M)}(\mathbf{x})$ are constant spinors times $\exp(i\mathbf{k}_M \cdot \mathbf{x})$. The mode killers may therefore be chosen to be of the form

$$\bar{V}_M^\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = A_M^\alpha e^{-i\mathbf{k}_M \cdot \mathbf{x}}, \quad (5.na)$$

where the A_M^α are constants, vanishing and not vanishing as in (5.aa). Then (w) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} G^{2'3'}(\mathbf{x}) &\equiv \sum_{N,L} R_{NL}^{(1)} K_{NL}[e] e^{-i(\mathbf{k}_N + \mathbf{k}_L) \cdot \mathbf{x}} = 0, \\ G^{3'1'}(\mathbf{x}) &\equiv \sum_{N,L} R_{NL}^{(2)} K_{NL}[e] e^{-i(\mathbf{k}_N + \mathbf{k}_L) \cdot \mathbf{x}} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (www)$$

with $R_{NL}^{(1)}$ and $R_{NL}^{(2)}$ constant. With modes $\beta^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\beta^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})$ chosen arbitrarily, it is clear that we can arrange $\beta^{(M)}(\mathbf{x})$ for $M = 3, 4, 5$ so that the linear independence assumed in (a) is satisfied. Furthermore U_A^α is constant, and it is easy to guarantee that assumption (b) is satisfied everywhere on Σ . The proof that all the K_{NL} must vanish is thus complete for flat Σ , but rests on the assumptions (a) and (b) which are not proven for general Σ .

Using the other terms in the constraint (k), it is straightforward to show that K_{mN} and K_{MN} must also vanish. Consider the mixed term K_{mN} . Since we have already shown

that $K_{NL} = 0$ for all L and N , setting the last term in (k) equal to zero implies

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{\hbar\kappa^2}{2}n_a(\mathbf{x})\sigma^a\bar{\sigma}^b\rho_i^{(m)}(\mathbf{x})\frac{\Delta K_{NL}}{\delta e_i^b(\mathbf{x})}[e] + 2\sqrt{-\hbar}\lambda_L\beta^{(L)}(\mathbf{x})K_{mN}[e] \\ & -\frac{\hbar\kappa^2}{2}n_a(\mathbf{x})\sigma^a\bar{\sigma}^b\tilde{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{x})\beta^{(L)}(\mathbf{x})\frac{\Delta K_{mN}}{\delta e_i^b(\mathbf{x})}[e] - \{N \leftrightarrow L\} = 0 . \end{aligned} \quad (aa)$$

As before, we can get rid of the term containing $\tilde{\sigma}_i\beta^{(L)}(\mathbf{x})$ by multiplying by mode killers $\bar{V}_L^\alpha(\mathbf{x})$. In this case we require two mode killers so that $\alpha = 1, 2$ and L and N run over 1 to 4. Likewise, we can introduce a new set of mode-killing functions $\bar{W}_m(\mathbf{x})$ which are orthogonal to the $\rho_i^{(m)}(\mathbf{x})$ modes:

$$\sum_m \bar{W}_m(\mathbf{x})\rho_i^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 . \quad (ab)$$

In this case we require only one of these mode-killers, and since $\rho_A^{(m)i}(\mathbf{x})$ has six components, we need 7 distinct modes, *i.e.* $m = 1, \dots, 7$. Multiplying (aa) by these mode killers, only the second term in (aa) survives, so that

$$\bar{V}_L^{[\alpha]}(\mathbf{x})\bar{V}_N^{[\beta]}(\mathbf{x})\bar{W}_m(\mathbf{x})\lambda_L\beta^{(L)}(\mathbf{x})K_{mN}[e] = 0 . \quad (5.ab)$$

We may rewrite this as

$$U_A^{[\alpha]}(\mathbf{x})H^{[\beta]}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 , \quad (ac)$$

where

$$U_A^\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \bar{V}_L^\alpha(\mathbf{x})\lambda_L\beta_A^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}) , \quad (ad)$$

and we have introduced

$$H^\beta(\mathbf{x}) = \bar{W}_m(\mathbf{x})\bar{V}_N^\beta(\mathbf{x})K_{mN}[e] . \quad (ae)$$

Although (ac) is not of precisely the same form as (s), the same reasoning applies (with SU(2) rather than SU(3)), and suffices to show that the mixed coefficients K_{mN} must all vanish.

Finally, the K_{mn} part of the wave function can be eliminated using the first term in (k). Defining a set of three mode killers $\bar{W}_m^\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ which satisfy (ab), we once again obtain an equation of the form (s), this time with

$$\begin{aligned} U_A^\alpha(\mathbf{x}) &= \bar{W}_m^\alpha(\mathbf{x}) D_i \rho_A^{(m)i}(\mathbf{x}) , \\ G^{\beta\gamma}(\mathbf{x}) &= \bar{W}_n^{[\beta}(\mathbf{x}) \bar{W}_l^{\gamma]}(\mathbf{x}) K_{nl}[e] . \end{aligned} \tag{af}$$

From here the analysis is almost identical to that following (s). The single exception arises due to the existence of modes with $D^i \rho_i^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$, which do not contribute to the definition of $U_A^\alpha(\mathbf{x})$. However, it is possible to consider sets of modes for which we obtain a nonzero $D^i \rho_i^{(m)}(\mathbf{x})$ multiplying any desired term K_{mn} , which is sufficient to show that every K_{mn} must vanish, as can be easily checked.

This completes the demonstration that there are no states with Grassmann number 2. The generalization to higher Grassmann numbers follows the above procedure very closely, so we will just outline the major steps. In a Grassmann number n state, the part of the constraint which involves only β modes leads to

$$U_A^{[\alpha}(\mathbf{x}) G^{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_n]}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 , \tag{ag}$$

where $U_A^\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ is defined in (q) and

$$G^{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_n}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{M_1 \dots M_n} \bar{V}_{M_1}^{[\alpha_1}(\mathbf{x}) \dots \bar{V}_{M_n}^{\alpha_n]}(\mathbf{x}) K_{M_1 \dots M_n}[e] \tag{ah}$$

is the natural generalization of (r). We rotate $U_A^\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ and $G^{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_n}(\mathbf{x})$ by $SU(n+1)$ matrices $\Lambda_\alpha^{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x})$, such that only the first one component of $U_1^{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x})$ and the first two components of $U_2^{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x})$ are nonvanishing. (This requirement leaves a residual $SU(n-1)$ freedom, which we will take advantage of below.) By judicious choice of the mode killers, the constraint equation implies that either $K_{1\dots n} = 0$, or both of the determinants

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) &\equiv \Lambda_{[1}^{2'}(\mathbf{x}) \Lambda_2^{3'}(\mathbf{x}) \dots \Lambda_n^{(n+1)'}(\mathbf{x}) , \\ \Lambda^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}) &\equiv \Lambda_{[1}^{1'}(\mathbf{x}) \Lambda_2^{3'}(\mathbf{x}) \dots \Lambda_n^{(n+1)'}(\mathbf{x}) , \end{aligned} \tag{bh}$$

must vanish.

As before, we define a set of $n + 1$ one-forms $\theta^i(\mathbf{x})$ in an n -dimensional space, where the components of $\theta^i(\mathbf{x})$ are the first n elements of row i of $\Lambda_\alpha^{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x})$:

$$\Lambda_\alpha^{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x}) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \theta^1(\mathbf{x}) & . \\ \hline \theta^2(\mathbf{x}) & . \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \theta^{n+1}(\mathbf{x}) & . \end{array} \right) \quad (5.72)$$

The hypothesis that both $\Lambda^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\Lambda^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})$ vanish is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^2(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \theta^3(\mathbf{x}) \dots \theta^{n+1}(\mathbf{x}) &= 0 , \\ \theta^1(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \theta^3(\mathbf{x}) \dots \theta^{n+1}(\mathbf{x}) &= 0 . \end{aligned} \quad (bi)$$

None of the $\theta^i(\mathbf{x})$ have all zero components; hence, we have either that $\theta^1(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \theta^2(\mathbf{x}) = 0$, or another pair of forms are wedge-orthogonal: $\theta^j(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \theta^k(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ for some $j, k > 2$. In the former case, all of the determinants $\Lambda^{(i)}(\mathbf{x})$ must vanish, and hence $\text{Det } \Lambda$ itself will vanish, thus yielding a contradiction. In the latter case, the residual $\text{SU}(n - 1)$ freedom left over after the values of $U_A^{\alpha'}(\mathbf{x})$ have been fixed may be used to rotate the components of $\theta^i(\mathbf{x})$ and $\theta^j(\mathbf{x})$ into one another such that one of these forms vanishes identically; however, since none of the forms may vanish this is also a contradiction. Thus one of the two determinants $\Lambda^{(1)}(\mathbf{x})$, $\Lambda^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})$ must be nonzero, and the constraint can only be satisfied if $K_{1\dots n}$ vanishes. By similar arguments all the other $K_{M_1\dots M_n}$, as well as the terms involving the ρ modes, suffer the same fate.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The main conclusion of this paper is that there are no physical states in $N = 1$ supergravity that are purely bosonic or have fixed finite Grassmann number n , nor can

there be any state which is a linear superposition of components with finite n . We conclude that all physical states in $N = 1$ supergravity must have infinite Grassmann number. It is curious that these results emerge from the supersymmetry constraints whose form is consistent with an expansion in states of definite Grassmann number. A study of the free spin-3/2 field gives a similar structure for physical (gauge invariant) states in that theory, and the infinite Grassmann number is seen to arise from the essentially multiplicative character of the gauge constraint (4.5). The constraint is satisfied by including a delta functional over an infinite number of fermionic modes in the state functional, realized as an infinite product of anti-commuting fields. In the interacting theory, the $\bar{S}$ constraint can again be made to act multiplicatively after projection with mode-killing functions in a similar way to (4.5) and (4.28), accounting for the absence of finite Grassmann number physical states.

The similarity between the results for the free and interacting theories can be contrasted with the situation in non-abelian gauge theories. The most apt comparison is with the electric-field formulation of SU(2) gauge theory of Goldstone and Jackiw [GJ]. There the Gauss law constraint for a free gauge field forces the physical state to contain an infinite product of delta functions in the longitudinal modes $k^i E^a_i(\mathbf{x})$. The states of the interacting theory, on the other hand, may be arbitrary functionals of the gauge-invariant tensor $S_{ij} = E^a_i(\mathbf{x})E^a_j(\mathbf{x})$. In supergravity we know of no local gauge invariant variables analogous to S_{ij} , while the fact that infinite Grassmann number can be established for the interacting theory as well as the free theory indicates that physical states in the full theory are closer to the free-field form than in non-abelian gauge theories.

Our results on the structure of physical states may also be contrasted with previous work on minisuperspace models of $N = 1$ supergravity [mini] in which purely bosonic physical states were found. The reason for this apparent discrepancy is the severe restriction on the allowed spatial dependence in minisuperspace models, and the consequent simplifi-

cation of the constraints (2.100)-(2.101). In most cases the gravitino derivative terms are completely absent from the constraints, and so bosonic solutions are allowed for the same reason that the zero modes of the free gravitino field are not restricted by the constraints in (4.28)-(4.29).

It is our hope that the results derived here have clarified the issues raised in [d93] and, independently, have illuminated the structure of physical states in canonically quantized supergravity. We must express the reservation that the procedure of solving the formal constraint equations without due attention to possible quantum anomalies is problematic [nicolai2], and we hope that the issue of anomalies is addressed in future work. The apparently simpler constraint structure of supergravity, when compared to that of general relativity, makes us optimistic about further progress.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to thank Andrei Barvinsky, Nathan Berkovits, Roger Brooks, Bernard de Wit, Peter D'Eath, Gary Gibbons, Marc Henneaux, Viqar Husain, Roman Jackiw, Hans-Jürgen Matschull, Hermann Nicolai and Barton Zwiebach for discussions which have influenced our work. This work has been supported in part by the U.S. National Science Foundation under grant PHY/92-06867, by the U.S. Department of Energy under contract DE-AC02-76ER03069, and by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

APPENDIX: NOTATION AND

SOME USEFUL IDENTITIES

We have chosen the following definitions for the Weyl spinor formalism:

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon_{AB} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \varepsilon^{AB} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\
\varepsilon^{AB}\phi_B &= \phi^A, & \varepsilon_{AB}\phi^B &= \phi_A \\
\varepsilon_A{}^B &= -\delta_A{}^B, \\
\sigma_{AA'}^a &= (1, \sigma_i) \\
\eta_{ab}\sigma_{AA'}^a\sigma_{BB'}^b &= 2\varepsilon_{AB}\varepsilon_{A'B'} \\
\bar{\sigma}_a^{A'A} &= \varepsilon^{AB}\varepsilon^{A'B'}\sigma_{aBB'} = (1, \sigma_i) .
\end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

The sigma matrices defined in this way obey a series of identities which are essential in deriving some of the results given in Secs. 2 and 4:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma^a\bar{\sigma}^b - \sigma^b\bar{\sigma}^a &= -i\varepsilon^{ab}{}_{cd}\sigma^c\bar{\sigma}^d \\
\bar{\sigma}^a\sigma^b - \bar{\sigma}^b\sigma^a &= i\varepsilon^{ab}{}_{cd}\bar{\sigma}^c\sigma^d \\
\sigma_{AA'}^a\bar{\sigma}^{bB'B} - \sigma_{AA'}^b\bar{\sigma}^{aB'B} &= \frac{1}{2} \left[(\bar{\sigma}^b\sigma^a)^{B'}{}_{A'}\delta_A{}^B + (\sigma^a\bar{\sigma}^b - \sigma^b\bar{\sigma}^a)_A{}^B\delta^{B'}{}_{A'} \right] \\
\sigma^a\bar{\sigma}^b + \sigma^b\bar{\sigma}^a &= 2\eta^{ab} \\
\bar{\sigma}^a\sigma^b + \bar{\sigma}^b\sigma^a &= 2\eta^{ab} \\
\sigma^a\bar{\sigma}^b\sigma^c + \sigma^c\bar{\sigma}^b\sigma^a &= 2 \left(\eta^{ab}\sigma^c + \eta^{bc}\sigma^a - \eta^{ac}\sigma^b \right) \\
\bar{\sigma}^a\sigma^b\bar{\sigma}^c + \bar{\sigma}^c\sigma^b\bar{\sigma}^a &= 2 \left(\eta^{ab}\bar{\sigma}^c + \eta^{bc}\bar{\sigma}^a - \eta^{ac}\bar{\sigma}^b \right) \\
\sigma^a\bar{\sigma}^b\sigma^c - \sigma^c\bar{\sigma}^b\sigma^a &= 2i\varepsilon^{abcd}\sigma_d \\
\bar{\sigma}^a\sigma^b\bar{\sigma}^c - \bar{\sigma}^c\sigma^b\bar{\sigma}^a &= -2i\varepsilon^{abcd}\bar{\sigma}_d \\
e_{ai}e_{bj}\sigma^a\bar{\sigma}^b &= h_{ij} - i\varepsilon_{ijk}n^ce^{dk}\sigma_c\bar{\sigma}_d\sqrt{-h} \\
e_{ai}e_{bj}\bar{\sigma}^a\sigma^b &= h_{ij} + i\varepsilon_{ijk}n^ce^{dk}\bar{\sigma}_c\sigma_d\sqrt{-h} \\
n^an^b(\sigma_a\bar{\sigma}_b)_A{}^B &= \delta_A{}^B, \quad n^an^b(\bar{\sigma}_a\sigma_b)^{A'}{}_{B'} = \delta^{A'}{}_{B'} .
\end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

Finally, we have defined

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon^{0123} &= \varepsilon^{123} = 1 \\
\varepsilon^{ijk} &= \varepsilon^{abcd} n_a e_b^i e_c^j e_d^k \sqrt{-h} \\
\varepsilon_{ijk} &= \varepsilon^{abcd} n_a e_{bi} e_{cj} e_{dk} \frac{1}{\sqrt{-h}} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

so that ε_{ijk} is a tensor density.

REFERENCES

- d84. P. D. D’Eath, Phys. Rev. D **29** (1984) 2199.
- pilati. M. Pilati, Nucl. Phys. **B132** (1978) 138.
- teitelboim. C. Teitelboim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38** (1977) 1106.
- fradkin. E. S. Fradkin and M. A. Vasiliev, Phys. Lett. **72B** (1977) 70.
- d93. P. D. D’Eath, “Physical states in $N = 1$ supergravity”, DAMTP preprint, hep-th/9304084.
- dandas. A. Das and D. Z. Freedman, Nucl. Phys. **B114** (1976) 271.
- mini. R. Graham, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** (1991) 1381; P. D. D’Eath and D. I. Hughes, Nucl. Phys. **B378** (1992) 381; P. D. D’Eath, S. W. Hawking and O. Obregón, Phys. Lett. **B300** (1993) 44; P. D. D’Eath, Phys. Rev. D **48** (1993) 713; R. Graham and H. Luckock, “The Hartle-Hawking state for the Bianchi IX model in supergravity”, gr-qc/9311004.
- nicolai2. H.-J. Matschull and H. Nicolai, “Canonical Quantum Supergravity in Three Dimensions,” gr-qc/9306018.
- nicolai. B. de Wit, H.-J. Matschull and H. Nicolai, Phys. Lett. **318B** (1993) 115.
- cs. M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, *Quantization of Gauge Systems* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1992).
- fadslav. L.D. Faddeev and A.A. Slavnov, *Gauge Fields: An Introduction to Quantum Theory*, 2nd ed. (Addison Wesley, Redwood City, California, 1991).
- GJ. J. Goldstone and R. Jackiw, Phys. Lett. **74 B** (1978) 81.
- senja. G. Senjanovich, Phys. Rev. D **16** (1977) 307.